

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 and 20-61 are cancelled. Claims 10-19 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

The specification has been amended to better conform with the requirements of U.S. practice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 10-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniels (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,500). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over Daniels.

Claim 10 defines a picture display device that includes:

communication means for bi-directionally communicating with each of the plurality of data process devices to receive associated synchronous frequency information for each of the plurality of video signals; [and]

video process means for combining the inputted plurality of video signals into a combined video signal for display on one screen according to associated picture size information for each of the plurality of video signals, the picture size information associated with a given one of the plurality of video signals being based on the received synchronous frequency information associated with that video signal[.]

Though Daniels is concerned with simultaneously displaying the output of two or more computers on a single monitor, the sections of Daniels that are cited by the Examiner neither disclose nor suggest *receiving associated synchronous frequency information for each of a plurality of video signals*.

It follows that the cited sections of Daniels do not disclose or suggest the combination set out in claim 10 and therefore do not anticipate the claim.

Claims 11-18 depend from claim 10 and are distinguishable over Daniels for at least the same reasons.

Claim 19 defines a method of displaying a video signal that includes:

bi-directionally communicating with each one of the plurality of data process devices to receive associated synchronous frequency information for each of the plurality of video signals; [and]

combining the received plurality of video signals into a combined video signal for display on one screen according to associated picture size information for each of the plurality of video signals, the picture size information associated with a given one of the plurality of video signals being based on the received synchronous frequency information associated with that video signal[.]

Claim 19 is therefore distinguishable over Daniels for at least the reasons set out above regarding claim 10.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/936,158

Docket No.: SONYSU 3.3-137

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: May 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ
Registration No.: 35,342
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant

645847_1.DOC